App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1932.

(Mey)

File No. 142-32

Serial Nos. 2, 3

Mey 32 1
32 1 3

Later References

~~Mey 142 - 32 - 1~~

Mey def 75-34

Mey 310-34 1-4 (14-1-34)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos.

Part B for April 33.

SUBJECT.

Appeal against the Mey Court's order
refusing claim of the Archakship of Sri Kali
Temple Hajaravalli Anekal Taluk

Munizamappa & Ramalinga

No. 1420 of 1933

P/3

Instructions regarding appeal cannot
be complied with as it has not been
instituted in time.

RG

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 3 — of 193 .

Serial No.

Petition of 11.2.33 filed by Mr H. Srinivasa Rao Advocate Bangalore city on behalf of his Client A. Ramalinga Chari and Muni Samachari appealing against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner in the matter of their Claim to archakship of Sri Kalekamba Temple - Vajarahalli Anekal Taluk.

Petn calling for a copy of the order appealed against is dated for order —

14/2

This is not an appeal. Perhaps a report with records may be called for from the Muzrai.

Fit Secy

(A. DR)

14/2/33

Re 23/2

4) Please see portion marked 3A on the last page of the petition and perusal Connected papers — Dy No. 7/2/33

6/3

Letter No 484/30-31 of 3.3.33 from the Muzrai Commissioner requesting to be informed in connection with the appointment of a Pujari to the Sri Kalikamba temple

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

3 MAR. 1933 3678

2) Mug appl 22 of 32-33

Mug File No. 142 of 1932-3 | General and Revenue Secretariat

re Vajanakalle Anchal Taluk whether The Current matter may be closed as no action seems called for.

1/ From mug 79-30-3 portion for reqd it will be seen that a petition received from Shri Somalingappa was forwarded to D.C for enquiry & report. The mug file 142-32-1 portion for reqd contains The report called for vide reqd above - The decision given by the hon. in mug appl 6 of 30-31 is dated 29th Sept 1931. from which date hence now no regular appeal has been preferred by the present petitioner - After elapse of nearly 1 year & 6 months present appeal has been received & is time barred.

9/3 6) Submitted reqd above & Papers

Shri Sanj)

8/3/33

1st Asst)

No 22/3.

8/3

OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASST TO THE A.G.P. MAR 1933 6183

Please issue an endorsement to Say that this petition which is really an Appeal against the orders of the Mug Comm has not been received in time and Can not be entertained

Mug 26/3/33

Asst

2/3/4

File No. 142 of 1932-3

Serial No.	
3	No 1420 & 10.4.1933 to the petitioners Muthusamy Ayyar and Ramalingam Pillai intimating that their Appeal cannot be entertained as it has not been submitted in time.
	No 1421 & 1074/33 to Mr. M. Srinivasa Rao Advocate intimating the orders passed on the petition.
	No 1422 & 1074/33 to the Hindu Religious Endowments Commissioner forwarding Copy of the Order passed on the appeal petition —

B. 1
18/4

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8-31.

File No. | of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Mog 142-32-2.



1556.



Stamp Rs 2

14/2/33

Before the Dewan Sahib
of Mysore Bangalore.

Petition no 22 of 32-33.

Petitioner

1. Ramasama chari
2. Ramakrishna chari age 60 years sons of Maliga-chari both residing in Vajarahalli Anekal Taluk.

Presented by Mr. H. Srinivasa Rao - Advocate

11.2.33

Muzrai Secretary to Government - his Compliments B.O

Engineer

11.2.33

The petitioners begs to state as follows:-

1) About the year 1702 A.D some people of the Viswa Karma community left their original place of Bekonkonda on account of a Severe attack of cholera and came near Bannerghatta from Rengeri side, and settled at a place which was then called Kalakurchi Hobali

the village then consisted of about ten people.

2. The prominent among the settlers were Brahmana Balachari and Chikka Linigachari. These people built the Sree Kalikamba temple at the place and Ramalingachari who was renowned for manufacturing cannons, installed the God Sree Kalikamba, obtained 'Uthsava Vigrahas' and made arrangements for the daily worship of Sree Kalikamba.

3. During the capture of the Bevanahally fort at that period, the Nawab who wanted efficient cannons sent for Ramalingachari, who manufactured three cannons within a very short period, which were named as 'Parabaya Bhaya Ram' 'Vira Hanumantha' and 'Thapan' and one 'Nirkara Dabbi' the first two were retained at Bangalore

but the other two were sent to Devanahally with the help of which the Nawab was able to capture the fort of Devanahally.

4) The Nawab well pleased with the services rendered by Ramalingachari asked him to name his reward. Ramalingachari without asking anything for himself, requested the Nawab to grant Inam lands for the benefit of the temple. The Nawab did so, and from that day, the village was called as 'Vajarahalli' or the village of the goldsmiths.

5) Ever since the temple came into existence, the temple remained in the management of Ramalingachari and his descendants for more than nine generations. The 'Ashtasara Nigraha' and other articles of the temples

have remained in the custody of the petitioner's family, daily worship, 'Deepa Radhana' and 'Uthsava' were being well performed. The devotees of the Godden, who were purely Visva Karma Brahmanas (Goldsmiths) by caste often visited the temple.

6) As the last person one Bhaskaracharri, who was entrusted with the management of the temple did not take any interest in the affairs of the temple, the Subdivision officer on 28-8-27 on the recommendation of the Amildar appointed Lakshmi Narasimhiah ~~appointed~~ 2nd as Poojari for a period of five years. The petitioners petitioned that the temple was built by their ancestors, and that it was meant for the goldsmith community and that the Inam lands were given to their family for certain services rendered during the

siege of Devanahally. On this representation, Ramalinga chari was appointed as Pooj and Laxminarasimhiah was directed to hand over the Temple lands to the possession of Ramalingachari. The Deputy Commissioner reversed this order on the ground that the Pooja in the temple was being performed according to Vaidic Shastras and that if the Goldsmiths performed the Pooja, the Brahmins would not perform 'Mantra Pushpa' and on these grounds, Laxminarasimhiah was again appointed as Poojari.

7) The petitioner begs to state that this temple was built by the goldsmith community, with their own funds, and Sree Kalikamba is their special goddess. They were the sole Poojaris for this temple for many years and

the Pooja that was being conducted was not according to Vaidic rites, but according to Sivagama. The temple lands were obtained by the ancestors of the petitioner by doing special services to them. And it is most unjust and unfair that these temple lands which were acquired by a member of their community should be handed over to a member of a different community. The sense of the whole community is also against ~~Lakshmanaswamy~~ Lakshmanaswamy ~~Mr~~ ~~opposed~~ during the Pooja the community people do not accept 'Nivedya' and 'Parada', and the temple is practically closed for the community. ~~Mr~~ ~~opposed~~ Lakshmanaswamy Mr according to the Sub-Division officer's order has been appointed tentatively for a period of five years. Hence

as that period has elapsed his office ought to be terminated.

8) The Sub-Division officer's order appointing him Poojari was not communicated to him. The Deputy Commissioner passed a one-sided order without notifying the petitioner. The Amtsari Commissioner merely confirmed the orders of the Deputy Commissioner the Government who called for a report from the Amtsari Commissioner appear to have filed the papers after the report was received by him.

9) Wherefore the petitioner prays that the ~~Officer~~ Laxmanaramaiah ought be removed from his office and the petitioner appointed as Poojari for the Kalikamba Temple at Rayarakelli Anekal Taluk Bangalore 11-2-33.



929
M. H. Srinivasa
11-2-33
B.L.L.Sahib

Before the Dewan Saheb of
ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ.
Mysore Bangalore

1933 — ಕ್ಕೆ Petition ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್,

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಆಪೋನೆಂಟ್

1. Munisama chari
2. Ramalinga chari

Vs.

Lakshmi Narasimha

ಮೆ|| ರಾ|| H. Srinivasa Rao B.A.L.L.B.
Advocate.

ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಜ್ಞೈರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸುವ ಬಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ನಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹ ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು } ರುಜು

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯ } ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.
ಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ಸಮಕ್ಷ್ಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

11.2.33

H. Srinivasa Rao
Advocate

ಯಂ. ಸಿ. ಪುಟ್ಟಯ್ಯ ಬುಕ್‌ಬಿಸ್ಪೋ ಶ್ರೀ ನಂದೀಶ ಭವನಸೀ ವಿಲಾಸ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ.

84
30-87

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE.

Bangalore, ... 193





S. HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ., M.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

1/7/3

Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
... ... 1..*Department.*

Returned
with Report from H.Q. Quarter

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

1420

Dated, Bangalore, 8th April 1933.

Muz 14 32-3

ENDORSEMENT.

To

Petitioners

Munishamachar and Ramalingachar,
Vajarahalli, Anekal Taluk.

With reference to petition dated 11th February 1933 filed by them in the matter of the archakship of Sri Kalikamba temple at the place, Munishamachar and Ramalingachar are informed that their petition which is really an appeal against the orders of the Muzrai Commissioner, has not been submitted in time and cannot be entertained.

By Order,

Sd/-S.Shamanna

Financial Secretary to Govt.

C.A.

F.T.O.

For No 421. dt 10-4-33

Copy to Mr.M. Srinivasa Rao, B.A., LL.B., Advocate for the petitioners.

By Order,

Sd/- S.Shamanna.
Asst Financial Secretary
to Government.

Memo No. 1422 dt 10-4-33

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Munsif Commissioner in Mysore with reference to his letter No. 684/-31 dated 3rd March 1933.

By Order,

For Financial Secretary to Go

ppendix F G—1]

UBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Miscl

File No. 142 - 32

Serial No. 3

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 1420.

To

Petrs

~~1 & 2~~ Muni Ramachar & Ramalingachar Vaigunthalli. Anekal Tk.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 10 - 4 - 33

Signed by B. Muddukrishnappa

Work regd to petn dt 11-2-33 filed by them in the matter of the archakship of Sri Kalikamba temple at the place, ~~Anekal~~ Munisamachar & Ramalingachar are informed that their petn which is really an appeal against the orders of the M.C, has not been held in time and cannot be entertained

B.O

14/33

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

WD 0253—GPB—15,000— 26-8-32